DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 542 HE 007 234

AUTHOR	Finkelstein, Martin
TITLE	The Incentive Grant Approach in Higher Education: A 15 Year Record. Institute for Educational Leadership Reports: Nine.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.
REPORT NO	IEL-9
PUB DATE	Dec 75
NOTE	65p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Institute for Educational Leadership, The George Washington University, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. (free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Administration; Directories; *Educational Accountability; *Educational Finance; Evaluation Methods; *Higher Education; *Incentive Grants; *Resource Allocations; State Programs; Surveys; Tables (Data); Universal Education; Universities

ABSTRACT

The incentive grant approach in higher Education is a resource allocation strategy that may have significant positive impact on educational performance. This document covers: (1) the incentive grant approach to resource allocation; (2) the evolution during the past 15 years of types of incentive grant programs and the contrasting roles played by state higher education agencies and multicampus systems in that evolution; (3) major patterns inthe administration of incentive grant programs; and (4) a directory to 55 incentive grant programs administered by higher education agencies and multicampus systems. Findings indicate that the incentive grant approach may: (1) provide incentive for participants to rechannel both efforts and resources into activities that support the new goals of universal access; (2) stimulate initiative for improvement within existing resources; and (3) yield the dual economic benefits of increased productivity and more effective targeting of resources. To these potential assets of the incentive grant approach must be added flexibility. Given these potentially positive impacts and the technique's potential adaptability to a variety of resource allocation situations, the central question becomes: How well does the approach, both generally and in its concrete variations, actually work? (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED119542

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

THE INCENTIVE GRANT APPROACH IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A 15 YEAR RECORD

MARTIN FINKELSTEIN

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
(202) 833-2745

HE 007 234

IEL REPORTS: NINE

DECEMBER 1975

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

ADVISORY BOARD

CHAIRPERSON – DR. BERNICE SANDLER
Director, Project on the Status and Education of Women
Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.

K.Z. CHAVIS
Program Director
Leadership Development Program, Atlanta

DR. JOHN DAVIS
President, Macalester College
Saint Paul, Minnesota

DR. JOHN DUNWORTH
President
George Peabody College, Nashville

DR. LLOYD ELLIOTT
President
The George Washington University

DR. MICHAEL FAY
Director
United Teachers' Los Angeles Urban Project

FRANCIS KEPPEL
Director
Aspen Institute Education Program

HONORABLE HOWARD KLEBANOFF
Chairman, House Education Committee
Hartford, Connecticut

RUTH MANCUSO
Chairperson
New Jersey State Board of Education

RUBY G. MARTIN
General Counsel, Committee on the District of Columbia
U.S. House of Representatives

DR. LOUIS H. MAYO
Vice President for Policy Studies and Special Projects
The George Washington University

HARRY McPHERSON, JR.
Attorney, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE JOHN PITTENGER
Secretary of Education
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

LOIS RICE
Vice President
College Entrance Examination Board

HONORABLE MARY RIEKE
Oregon State Representative

DR. ALAN ROSENTHAL
Director
Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University

DR. PAUL B. SALMON
Executive Director
American Association of School Administrators

DR. RICHARD C. SNYDER
Mershon Professor of Education and Public Policy
Ohio State University

DR. CHARLES WATTS
President
Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

DR. PAUL N. YLVISAKER
Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education

INSTITUTE STAFF

SAMUEL HALPERIN – Director
DIETRA ROGERS – Chief Administrative Officer
JUNE FRANK – Budget Officer

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR
GEORGE LANE – Director
SHARON ENRIGHT – Associate Director

THE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM
JAMES BROWNE – Coordinator

EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
PAUL SCHINDLER – Director

"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION" OVER NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO
JOHN MERROW – Executive Producer

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY
KENNETH C. FISCHER – Director

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION
ALICE G. SARGENT – Coordinator

CAREER EDUCATION POLICY PROJECT
GEORGE KAPLAN – Coordinator

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Suite 310
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Samuel Halperin
Director
(202) 833-1737

Washington Internships in Education
(202) 223-3415

Educational Staff Seminar
(202) 293-3166

The Associates Program
(202) 785-4991

Leadership Training Institute
(202) 833-9051

Postsecondary Education Convening Authority
(202) 833-2745

"Options on Education" over National Public Radio
(202) 833-9178

THE INCENTIVE GRANT APPROACH IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A 15-YEAR RECORD

Postsecondary Education Convening Authority
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 310
Washington, D. C. 20036
(202) 833-2745

IEL REPORTS: NINE DECEMBER 1975

This work was developed under a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of that Agency, and no official endorsement of these materials should be inferred.

Preface

The Institute for Educational Leadership's Postsecondary Education Convening Authority (PECA) is pleased to publish this "state-of-the-art" paper on the use of incentive grants in postsecondary education by States and multi-campus systems. PECA commissioned Martin Finkelstein, a graduate student at the State University of New York at Buffalo, to undertake the study last spring and to have a draft report prepared for a summer conference on State financing of postsecondary education. This time constraint left Marty little choice as to research format; he had to use the phone. Through his considerable ingenuity and perserverance, Marty was able to wind his way through the labyrinth of State agencies and to make contact with the appropriate resource person in every one of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Through these telephone interviews, Marty gathered an enormous amount of data, which is skillfully analyzed in the report and conveniently arrayed in the comprehensive appendices.

This study is not an evaluation of incentive grants. It is a pioneering effort to "get the facts" on the characteristics of past and present incentive grant efforts. This survey also paves the way for a thorough evaluation study of incentive grants, an endeavor now under consideration by PECA.

I wish to extend a special thanks to Robert Berdahl, a professor of higher education at the State University of New York at Buffalo who is presently on leave at the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, and to Charles Bunting, program officer at the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Each gave PECA valuable counsel on the study design.

A single copy of this report is free. Multiple copies sell for $2.00 each.

PECA has published two earlier reports, Government Funding Policies and Nontraditional Programs and Approaches to State Licensing of Private Degree-Granting Institutions. Single copies are free and can be obtained by writing or calling PECA (202/833-2745).

The report of PECA's July conference on "State Funding of Postsecondary Education: Incentives for Improvement," co-sponsored with the Education Commission of the States and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, should be available in January.

Kenneth C. Fischer
Director
Postsecondary Education
Convening Authority

Institute for Educational Leadership
The George Washington University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	iii
Table of Contents	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE INCENTIVE GRANT APPROACH IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A 15-YEAR RECORD	3
Underlying Assumptions	3
Goals and Objectives of Incentive Grant Programs	4
Rationale of the Incentive Grant Approach	7
Changing the Status Quo	7
Beating the Budget Crunch	8
III. THE EVOLUTION OF GRANT PROGRAMS SINCE 1960	10
IV. PATTERNS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAMS	14
Sources and Modes of Program Support	14
Level of Program Funding	17
Bases for the Allocation of Program Funds to Projects	19
Degree of Competitiveness in the Allocation of Program Funds	21
V. PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS	24
Organizational Locus	24
Participants	25
Review Criteria	27
Locus of Administrative Authority	28
Procedures for Insuring Accountability	29
Dissemination of Project Results	30
Total Program Ev luation	31
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	33

Page

APPENDIX 35

I. Incentive Grant Programs Administered by State Agencies and Multi-campus Systems in the Fifty States 35

II. The Characteristics of 55 Incentive Grant Programs Organized by Program Type 39

INTRODUCTION

This report emerges from a recent survey of incentive grant programs administered by State higher education agencies and multi-campus systems.* It is divided into four sections. In the first section, the reader is introduced to the incentive grant approach to resource allocation. The basic underlying assumptions of the approach and its rationale are presented. Then the broad goals of educational improvement that state agencies and multi-campus systems have sought to attain via the incentive grant approach, as well as specific types of programs derived from these purposes, are identified.

The second section sketches the evolution during the past 15 years of types of incentive grant programs and the contrasting roles played by State higher education agencies and multi-campus systems in that evolution.

The third section depicts the major patterns in the administration of incentive grant programs.

The last section, which takes the form of an appended Directory, serves as a practical guide to the 55 incentive grant programs that are, or have been, administered by higher education agencies and multi-campus systems in the 50 States. It cross-references all programs surveyed by State and program type. Thus, Appendix I identifies those States that have experimented with each type of incentive

---

* We exclude under this rubric institutions that may have several "branch campuses." Unlike the administratively independent campuses within a multi-campus system, each with its own President or Chancellor, a branch campus is headed by a Director, Provost, or Vice President.

grant program. Appendix II then presents for each program type, and within each program type, for each State, a concise description of the salient characteristics of each incentive grant program. It further identifies those individuals who have either directly administered these programs or who are otherwise most fully abreast of recent program developments.

THE INCENTIVE GRANT APPROACH IN HIGHER EDUCATION: A 15-YEAR RECORD

Underlying Assumptions

The incentive grant approach focuses on the relationship between the form or technique for allocating State resources, on the one hand, and educational performance, on the other. It seeks to build into the allocation technique itself incentives that will channel institutional efforts into improvement activities.

To date, 17 State agencies and 13 multi-campus systems in 25 States were experimenting, or had experimented, with the incentive grant technique of resource allocation. While diverse in purpose, scope, and modus operandi, the 55 incentive grant programs sponsored by these State agencies and multi-campus systems share a common set of assumptions -- assumptions which define the distinctive elements of the incentive grant approach.

1. Improvement can best be achieved not by direct State agency or central office intervention, but rather by selectively stimulating local initiative. It is thus for the central office to formulate the broad goals that set performance parameters, while simultaneously offering incentives that encourage the participants in higher education (both faculty members and institutions) to define the problems, and propose and implement their solutions.

2. Local initiative can best be harnessed by allocating funds on a project basis to those proposed ventures judged most worthy in an open-competition, either among or within institutions. The linking of dollars to ideas rather than to enrollment stimulates initiative (the institution or the department can no longer count on continued levels of support for merely "standing pat"), while the competitive

situation tends to bring to the fore the very best ideas. Dollars can thus be earmarked only for those projects which promise the greatest benefit.

Goals and Objectives of Incentive Grant Programs

In the foregoing discussion, the incentive grant approach was characterized as a technique of resource allocation that "builds in" incentives for improvement. This characterization raises the question of just what constitutes "improvement," i.e. incentives "for what." A look at the broad goals that have been explicit or implicit in incentive grant programs, and the concrete objectives they have sought to achieve, provides an empirical map of how State higher education agencies and multi-campus systems have defined "improvement."

The twin goals that State agencies and multi-campus systems have tried to achieve concurrently via the incentive grant approach are efficiency and effectiveness. Efficiency refers to the cost-effectiveness of the educational activity in question. Effectiveness, always pursued within the framework of cost-effectiveness, refers most generally to enhancing the outputs of educational activities, e.g. increasing the subject matter knowledge gained from the "teaching" activities of a professor. Recently, however, effectiveness has come to be linked with the broad social goal of expanding the scope of higher educational activities to benefit ever larger segments of the public, i.e., of adapting higher education to the requirements of universal access. This broad social goal has at least three components:

1. increasing access to the educational activities and/or certification benefits of higher education institutions for non-traditional clienteles (especially adults and minority groups);
2. increasing the variety of learning options available to match the increasing heterogeneity of the student population;
3. increasing the outreach of higher education institutions into the local community.

To achieve these as well as more traditional broad goals, four concrete types of incentive grant programs have taken shape: those that seek to improve teaching and learning (Type I); those that seek to advance knowledge (Type II); those that seek to improve institutional public service activities (Type III); and those that seek to foster interinstitutional cooperation (IV). A fifth program type, which we have labeled "multi-purpose," includes those programs that simultaneously focus on more than one of the above objectives. Table 1 below sets forth the program types and delineates for each type the variety of strategies or activities used to implement their objective.

Table 1

INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAMS BY OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

Objectives: I. Improving Teaching and Learning	II. Advancing Knowledge	III. Improving Public Service	IV. Fostering Inter-institutional Cooperation	V. Multi-Purpose
Strategies:				
a. via development & application of new methods and materials to classroom instruction	a. via the strengthening of faculty (esp. junior faculty) research skills	a. via community-outreach programs	a. in instructional & curricular development activities	
b. via development of tools to facilitate the evaluation of teaching & learning	b. via provision of "seed" money for research projects that show promise of attracting extramural support	b. via applied research that attacks local, regional, or Statewide problems	b. in ongoing academic programs	
c. via development of new courses & academic programs		c. via development &/or improvement of training programs to meet local, regional, or Statewide manpower needs	c. in academic support services (e.g., libraries; computing; counseling & placement)	
d. via development of special programs to meet the educational needs of nontraditional clienteles			d. in planning	
e. via in-service training of faculty & staff in new methods of instruction &/or in the educational needs of nontraditional students.			e. via faculty exchange	
f. via encouragement of faculty research and/or continuing education in their discipline or related areas that deepens & broadens the knowledge they bring to the classroom			f. via student cross-registration	

Rationale of the Incentive Grant Approach

Why does the kind of "improvement" of educational performance that these State higher education agencies and multi-campus systems have sought to stimulate require the introduction of special incentives framed in a distinctive approach to resource allocation?

Two sets of rationales exist for the adoption of the incentive grant approach: the first set concerns the relationship between the nature of the desired improvements and the current incentive structure operative in higher education. The second set involves the relationship between the desire for continued improvement and the current fiscal crisis in higher education.

Changing the Status Quo

Educational improvement, as it is now defined by State agencies and multi-campus systems, requires higher education to add new tasks to its repertoire, or at least to realign its energies among current tasks. New incentives are then required to supplement existing ones. These incentives can serve to rechannel effort and resources into activities consonant with new directions. Thus, for example, as higher education seeks to extend itself beyond the campus and to reach new clienteles, the teaching function assumes particular importance, an importance equal to that of research and knowledge production. But tenure and promotion policy have historically been the source of incentives toward research activity, and therefore disincentives to teaching activity. Thus the need for policies and procedures that give teaching a more equal status with research is clear.

In addition, incentives implicit in current policy and procedures in higher education may prove a stumbling block to the achievement of newly espoused goals. New incentives thus become necessary to offset the impact of those currently operating. Thus, for example, resource allocation strategies that tie appropriations to full-time student-equivalency enrollment or the generation of student-credit-hours implicitly create incentives for institutions (a) to compete with each other for an ever shrinking pool of available students; and (b) to involve these students in traditionally credit-bearing, ipso facto revenue-producing, educational activities. If higher education is to put itself directly into the community's service and involve new clienteles (who may or may not be interested in credits and degrees) in novel educational activites, then special incentives for new and non-credit bearing courses will be essential. Likewise, since dwindling resources require interinstitutional cooperation to provide the student with appropriate educational experiences at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayer, special incentives for cooperative activity must be introduced to offset the incentives toward competition.

Beating the Budget Crunch

The fiscal rationale for an incentive grant approach is equally compelling. The lack of availability of surplus resources with which to launch new ventures might be expected to depress initiative and invite educational stagnation. A resource allocation technique that, within available resources, can keep alive, indeed nourish, creative initiatives for improvement, can go a long way toward assuring a continuity of educational progress.

Finally, the incentive grant technique, since it targets the limited resources available to those educational activities that offer the greatest educational benefits, promises to optimize the return on every educational dollar expended.

THE EVOLUTION OF INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAMS SINCE 1960

Table 2 below charts the growth in numbers of incentive grant programs between 1960 and 1975.

Table 2

NUMBER OF INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAMS BY PROGRAM TYPE, 1960-1975

Program Type	1960	1965	1970	1975	Totals 1960-1975
Teaching/Learning	0	1	10	19	25
Knowledge	2	4	8	7	10
Public Service	1	2	2	10	11
Cooperative	0	0	0	5	5
Multi-purpose	0	0	1	4	4
All	3	7	21	45	55

The table indicates that programs for advancing knowledge were the first to emerge, some as early as the late 50's. Their advent coincided with the post-Sputnik infusion of Federal dollars into research; and, indeed, these programs sought to provide "seed" money to research ventures that showed promise of attracting a share of that new Federal largesse. These programs grew at a rather slow rate until the early 70's, when their numbers began to decline.

Programs for improving teaching and learning were not ushered in until the late 1960's, in the wake of student protest and the controversy over the proper balance between research and teaching.

They have proliferated ever since that time, accounting for nearly half the current crop of incentive grant programs.

While the earliest public service programs antedate the teaching/learning programs, the former were all of the applied research variety. It was not until the early 70's that increasing public pressure on higher education to contribute solution's to the nation's pressing social and economic ills resulted in both the growth in number of public service programs and their diversification, i.e. their moving away from a unilateral focus on applied research to the community outreach and manpower training areas.

The most recent programs to emerge are those for fostering interinstitutional cooperation and the hybrids we have labeled "multi-purpose." The former have arisen in response to the ever deepening fiscal crunch of the early and mid 70's. They include two sub-species:

1) contractual or complementary programs wherein funding permits institutions to buy faculty time, classroom slots, etc. from other institutions rather than hire new faculty or offer more courses (e.g., Connecticut and Ohio);
2) cooperative programs, wherein funding permits institutions to embark on joint ventures, in areas such as planning and program development, instructional development, etc. (e.g., Illinois, SUNY).

The latter have emerged in response to the variety of pressures described above and constitute a consolidated effort to achieve most fully the broad goals set forth in section two.

Table 3 below compares the number of State agencies and multi-campus systems employing incentive grant approaches in our five program areas since 1960.

Table 3

NUMBER OF STATE AGENCIES & NUMBER OF MULTI-CAMPUS SYSTEMS SPONSORING INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAMS BY PROGRAM TYPE 1960 - 1975

Program Type	1960		1965		1970		1975		Totals 1960-1975	
	State Agen.	Multi-Campus	State Agen.	Multi-Campus	State Agen.	Multi-Campus	State Agen.	Multi-Campus	State Agen.	Multi-Campus
Teaching/ Learning	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	8	8	9
Knowledge	0	2	0	4	1	7	2	5	3	6
Public Service	0	1	1	1	1	1	4	5	4	5
Cooperative	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	1
Multi-purpose	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	2
All	0	2	1	4	4	9	12	12	17	13

The table reveals differences between the two with respect to:

(1) the timing of their entrance into the incentive grant arena;

(2) the program areas to which each has applied the technique.

State higher education agencies were later in their adoption of incentive grant approaches than were multi-campus systems. Indeed, most State-agency-sponsored programs have been initiated during the last five or six years. Once having begun, however, their experimentation with the incentive grant technique has mushroomed to the point where, today, the extent of their experimentation (both in terms of numbers of agencies employing the incentive grant technique and in terms of the actual number of discrete programs they administer)

is on a par with that of multi-campus systems. Two of the program areas in which they have sought to generate improvement via the incentive grants are areas of concern already staked out by multi-campus systems: teaching and learning, and public service. State agencies, however, have developed a distinctive target area for which to provide incentives for improvement (one that befits the scope of their tasks and perspective) of interinstitutional cooperation. They have not sought, to the same degree as multi-campus systems, to use incentive grants as a means of advancing knowledge.

PATTERNS IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAMS

How do State higher education agencies and multi-campus systems actually administer their incentive grant programs? The nine aspects of program operation which constitute a grant cycle were identified as: sources and modes of program support; level of program funding; bases employed for allocating program funds to individual projects; degree of competitiveness in awarding grants; the proposal review process (including its organizational locus, participants, and the review criteria employed); the locus of administrative authority; measures to insure project accountability to program goals; modes of dissemination of project results; and total program evaluation. For each aspect of program operation, major patterns as reflected in current practice are identified, and where appropriate, related to variation in program sponsorship (whether State agency or multi-campus system), program type, and source of program support.

Sources and Modes of Program Support

Table 4 identifies the three major sources of support of incentive grant programs: direct State appropriations, multi-campus system discretionary funds, and endowments/gifts/bequests. It further distinguishes among three modes of direct State support as well as among three types of multi-campus system discretionary funds.

Table 4

TAXONOMY OF SOURCES/MODES OF PROGRAM SUPPORT

I. Direct State Appropriation	II. Systemwide Discretionary Funds	III. Endowment Income, Gifts & Bequests
a. special legislative funding for program over & above institutional operating appropriations	a. overhead reimbursements on grants and contracts	
b. inclusion of program as an item in operating budget	b. budgetary savings	
c. statutory proviso mandating that a % of operating appropriations be expended on innovative projects	c. revenues accrued from educational fees	

An examination of the variety of modes and types of support suggests that the incentive grant approach as an allocation technique is independent of any particular mode or type of support, i.e. that it can be applied with equal facility to the distribution of operating budget funds as well as to the distribution of special legislative appropriations or multi-campus discretionary funds.

Variation in the source of program support as a function of program type and sponsorship is documented in Table 5.

Table 5

VARIATION IN SOURCE OF SUPPORT BY PROGRAM TYPE AND PROGRAM SPONSORSHIP

Program Type	Program Sponsor	N	% Supported by Direct State Appropriation	% Supported by Multi-campus Discretionary Funds	% Supported by Endowments/ Gifts/Bequests
Teaching/ Learning	State Agency	10	80%	0	20%
	Multi-campus System	15	67%	33%	0
	Totals	25	72%	20%	8%
Knowledge	State Agency	4	50%	25%	25%
	Multi-campus System	6	50%	50%	0
	Totals	10	50%	40%	10%
Public Service	State Agency	6	100%	0	0
	Multi-campus System	5	40%	0	60%
	Totals	11	73%	0	27%
Cooperative	State Agency	4	100%	0	0
	Multi-campus System	1	0	100%	0
	Totals	5	80%	20%	0
Multi-purpose	State Agency	1	100%	0	0
	Multi-campus System	3	33%	67%	0
	Totals	4	50%	50%	0
All	State Agency	25	84%	4%	12%
	Multi-campus System	30	53%	37%	10%
	Totals	55	67%	21%	12%

Table 5 reveals that a far greater percentage of State-agency-sponsored programs are supported by direct State appropriations. It would appear, then, that direct State support follows upon State sponsorship. However, the data also suggest that program type is often as closely associated with variation in funding source as program sponsorship. Thus, the vast majority (72%) of programs for the improvement of teaching and learning, irrespective of sponsoring agency, are directly State supported, so too are public service and interinstitutional cooperation programs. Programs for the advancement of knowledge receive, in comparison with other program categories, a higher proportion of their support from over-head reimbursements on grants and contracts (although this is, to some extent, a function of the greater involvment of multi-campus systems in this program area).

Level of Program Funding

An examination of those programs funded at an annual level exceeding $1 million reveals that 7/8 are directly State supported, while 5/8 are sponsored by State higher education agencies. Higher funding level thus appears to be associated primarily with the resources available to funding source and secondarily (insofar as source of program support is correlated with program sponsorship) to the type of program sponsor.

Table 6 details variation among program types during 1974-75 in

a) gross level of support;

b) average level of support per program within each program type;

c) average level of support per sponsoring agency within each program type.

Table 6

VARIATION AMONG PROGRAM TYPES IN LEVEL OF SUPPORT, 1974-75

	Program Types					
	Teaching/ Learning	Knowledge	Public Service	Cooper-tive	Multi-Purpose	All
Gross Level of Support (in thousands)	$7386 (31.1%)	$5710 (28.7%)	$3963 (19.9%)	$1935 (9.7%)	$925 (4.6%)	$19,919 (100.0%)
Average Level of Support per Program (in thousands)	$ 389	$ 816	$ 396	$ 387	$ 231	---
Average Level of Support per Sponsoring Agency (in thousands)	$ 568	$ 816	$ 440	$ 287	$ 308	---

While programs for the improvement of teaching and learning claim the largest percentage of all dollars expended in incentive grant programs, we find that programs for advancing knowledge show the highest average level of support per program, more than twice that of any other program type. These figures, however, overplay the disparity between programs for the advancement of knowledge and those for the improvement of teaching and learning, since in the case of the latter program type, several multi-campus systems simultaneously administer more than one program. Thus, if we examine the average level of support per sponsoring agency for each

type of program, we find the gap considerably narrowed: each discrete sponsoring agency expends an average of $815,714 per research program, but $568,154 per teaching and learning program.

Bases for the Allocation of Program Funds to Projects

Current incentive grant practice includes two alternative strategies for the allocation of program funds. In the first such strategy (in use in 3/4 of all programs surveyed), funds are directly disbursed to projects in a centrally sponsored, open competition among all eligible institutions or their members; in the second (in use in just under 1/4 of all programs surveyed), funds are distributed to all eligible campuses on the basis of their size (variously judged by the number of student FTEs, number of full-time faculty, size of operating budget) and then allocated directly to proposed projects in a campus-sponsored competition. While the former strategy seeks to maximize the value of the competitive situation for stimulating initiative, the latter seeks to achieve a balance between the virtues of competition and the desire for campus autonomy.

The relationship between allocation strategy, on the one hand, and program sponsorship, source of program support, and program type, on the other, is set forth in Table 7.

Table 7

VARIATION IN ALLOCATION STRATEGY BY PROGRAM SPONSORSHIP, SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT, AND PROGRAM TYPE

		N	Allocation Strategy: Centralized, Open Competition	Campus Size
Program Sponsor	State Agency	25	80%	20%
	Multi-campus System	30	73%	27%
Source of Program Support	Direct State Appropriations	36	78%	22%
	Multi-campus Discretionary Funds	13	62%	38%
	Endowments/ Gifts/Bequests	6	100%	0
Program Type	Teaching/ Learning	25	72%	28%
	Knowledge	10	60%	40%
	Public Service	11	100%	0
	Cooperative	5	100%	0
	Multi-purpose	4	50%	50%
All Programs		55	76%	24%

Three sets of observations are in order. First, while multi-campus sponsored programs show a slightly higher incidence of the use of the second strategy, the difference is minimal. Sponsorship is thus not clearly associated, one way or the other, with allocation strategy. Second, programs supported by multi-campus discretionary funds use the second strategy with considerably greater frequency than other programs. Funding source thus seems to bear

some relation to allocation strategy. Finally, while 40% of the programs for the advancement of knowledge and almost 30% of those for improving teaching and learning employ the second allocation strategy, none of the public service or interinstitutional cooperation programs do. Thus, allocation strategy appears to vary with program type; and those programs in areas traditionally within the prerogatives of faculty show a greater tendency to use the second allocation strategy.

Degree of Competitiveness in the Allocation of Program Funds*

Among all the incentive grant programs allocating funds on the basis of a centralized, open competition, just under one-third of all proposals submitted are actually funded. While Table 8a below indicates no difference in competitiveness between State agency and multi-campus sponsored programs, the data presented in Tables 8b and 8c suggest that variation does exist among programs supported from different sources and among program types.

Table 8a

VARIATION IN COMPETITIVENESS
BY PROGRAM SPONSORSHIP

Program Sponsor	N	% Accepted
State Agency	11	32.7%
Multi-campus System	14	31.9%
Total	25	32.2%

* Data on competitiveness (i.e. the % of project proposals submitted that are actually funded) was gathered only for those programs that allocate funds in a centrally sponsored, open competition. Thus, for program types wherein a large % of programs allocate funds on the basis of campus size (e.g., research programs), the figures presented above may be less accurate.

Table 8b

VARIATION IN COMPETITIVENESS
BY SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT

Source of Program Support	N	Competitiveness
Direct State Appropriations	16	28.9%
Multi-campus Discretionary Funds	5	34.2%
Endowments/Gifts/Bequests	4	43.0%
Total	25	32.2%

Table 8c

VARIATION IN COMPETITIVENESS
BY PROGRAM TYPE

Program Type	N	Competitiveness
Teaching/Learning	12	27.5%
Knowledge	3	44.0%
Public Service	6	37.0%
Cooperative	3	32.0%
Multi-purpose	1	12.5%
Total	25	32.2%

First, programs that are directly State-supported tend to be more competitive than either those funded by multi-campus discretionary funds or those funded by endowments/gifts/bequests. Second, programs for the improvement of teaching and learning tend to be the most competitive, followed by programs for fostering inter-institutional cooperation, public service programs, and research programs.

PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

Organizational Locus --

Table 9 presents the data on the organizational locus of the proposal review process, including variation by program type, program sponsorship, and source of program support.

Table 9

VARIATION IN THE ORGANIZATIONAL LOCUS OF THE PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS BY PROGRAM SPONSORSHIP, SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT, AND PROGRAM TYPE

		N	% Decentralized	% Centralized	% Multi-level
Program Sponsor	State Agency	25	12%	72%	16%
	Multi-campus System	30	23%	47%	30%
Source of Program Support	Direct State Appropriations	36	17%	58%	25%
	Multi-campus Discretionary Funds	13	31%	38%	31%
	Endowments/ Gifts/Bequests	6	0	83%	17%
Program Type	Teaching/ Learning	25	20%	44%	36%
	Knowledge	10	40%	60%	0
	Public Service	11	0	82%	18%
	Cooperative	5	0	80%	20%
	Multi-purpose	4	50%	50%	0
All Programs		55	20%	58%	22%

A glance at the table reveals that some 60% of all incentive grant programs surveyed centralize the proposal review process in either the State agency or the multi-campus system central office, about 20% decentralize it to the campuses, and another 20% provide for review at both the institutional and central levels. It should be noted, however, that in 66% of those cases where multilevel review occurs, the campus role is one of "screening," and actual funding decisions are made centrally. As might be expected, those programs sponsored by State agencies and supported by direct State appropriations more frequently centralize the review process. On the other hand, those program types most closely associated with the strategy of allocation on the basis of campus size (Types II, I, and V), show a higher incidence of decentralized and multi-level review procedures.

Participants

The incidence of participation by various constituencies in the proposal review process is portrayed in Table 10.

Table 10

VARIATION IN THE FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPATION OF VARIOUS CONSTITUENCIES IN THE PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS BY PROGRAM SPONSORSHIP, SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT, AND PROGRAM TYPE

		N	Faculty	Students	Campus Admin.	Central Staff	Consul-tants	Lay
Program Sponsor	State Agency	21	52.4%	9.5%	47.6%	85.7%	19.0%	14.3%
	Multi-campus System	27	77.7%	22.2%	63.0%	55.6%	18.5%	14.8%
Source of Program Support	Direct State Appropriations	33	57.6%	15.2%	57.6%	75.8%	27.3%	18.2%
	Multi-campus Discretionary Funds	10	90.0%	30.0%	60.0%	50.0%	0	10.0%
	Endowments/ Gifts/Bequests	5	80.0%	0	40.0%	60.0%	0	0
Program Type	Teaching/ Learning	22	72.7%	36.4%	63.6%	77.3%	22.7%	4.5%
	Knowledge	9	100.0%	0	33.3%	22.2%	11.0%	0
	Public Service	10	60.0%	0	70.0%	70.0%	20.0%	40.0%
	Coopera-tive	5	0	0	40.0%	100.0%	20.0%	20.0%
	Multi-purpose	2	50.0%	0	50.0%	100.0%	0	50.0%
All Programs		48	66.7%	16.7%	56.3%	68.8%	18.8%	14.6%

The data indicate that the arbiters of project funding are most often State agency or multi-campus-system central office staff, faculty members, and campus administrators; they are least often outside consultants, students, or the lay public. Incidence of participation does, however, vary with program sponsorship, source of program funds, and program type. As might be expected, campus constituencies are

less well represented in the review process of those programs sponsored by State agencies and funded by direct State appropriations, while central agency/office staff are concomitantly better represented. Faculty decision-making power is most evident in those areas traditionally their domain, teaching/learning and research. Most of the outside consultant, and all of the student, participation occurs in programs for the improvement of teaching and learning. Participation on the part of the lay public occurs most often in programs for improving public service. All in all, programs for the improvement of teaching and learning appear to draw upon the wisdom of the greatest diversity of constituencies in making allocation decisions.

Review Criteria

While, by and large, the criteria for the evaluation of project proposals differ among program types, two related criteria seem to be virtually universal. The first of these, potential project impact, has two components: potential scope of impact, i.e., the number of learners, or disciplines, or institutions that can benefit from the project; potential continuity of impact, i.e., to what extent the project is likely to make lasting contributions to the improvement of educational performance. The second of these is departmental or institutional support, i.e., the extent to which the department or institution is committed to continuing support for successful projects once the tenure of the grant has expired. This institutional commitment generally must be demonstrated by the institution's willingness to bear part of the costs of the project. By this means, several

incentive grant programs have managed to attract one dollar in institutional "matching funds" for every dollar allocated. By this means, too, some degree of internal reallocation of resources to improvement activities has been achieved.

Locus of Administrative Authority

With the exception of the California State College and University System's "Fund for Innovation" where administrative responsibility is lodged in a special unit within the system central office (the Division of New Program Development and Evaluation), the administration of virtually all incentive grant programs is the part-time responsibility of a staff member in the State agency or the multi-campus system office. That staff member often shares administrative tasks with a committee, which may consist of other central staff or of institutional representatives. In the latter case, it is usually the committee that assumes the substantive responsibilities of determining program priorities, guidelines, and review criteria, leaving day-to-day operations to the staff member. In the former case, the locus of substantive responsibility varies with the status of the particular staff member. In the case of those programs where funds are allocated on the basis of campus size and the competition is campus, rather than centrally, sponsored, some administrative tasks devolve, as overload, on a senior level campus executive (usually the chief academic officer) and his staff.

Procedures for Insuring Accountability

Owing to their part-time, sparsely staffed, highly centralized pattern of administration, many incentive grant programs have had to focus particular attention on the problem of just how to insure accountability for program funds. Thus far, three principal strategies have emerged.

I. Procedural Strategies include:

1) withholding a percentage of project budgets pending receipt of a final project report;

2) rendering project directors ineligible for subsequent support under the program unless a final report is rendered (employed most often in research programs).

II. Staffing Strategies include:

1) on-site project visitations by central staff and/or designated outside consultants;

2) the designation of a selected faculty member or administrator on each eligible campus as campus coordinator or liaison, responsible for serving as primary contact during both the proposal development and execution phases, and for monitoring all funded projects on their respective campuses (Cal. State; Florida CCs; New Hampshire).

III. The Incentive Strategy, currently employed only by the University of Illinois' "Instructional Awards Program," stimulates a competition among already completed project reports judged most worthy by campus faculty committees.

While the use of the above strategies crosses sponsorship, funding source, and program type lines, one particular strategy has developed to address the special problems with respect to accountability posed by those programs that allocate funds on the basis of campus size. Both the Florida Community College System's "Staff and Program Development Program" and the University of California's "State $1 Million Fund" employ a procedure whereby campuses are required to submit a plan for the allocation of program funds which is subject to central review. Once approved, the plan serves as a basis for subsequent evaluation by the central office as well as for review of subsequent annual plans.

Dissemination of Project Results

Since the incentive grant approach funds improvement activities on a project basis, and seeks maximal system impacts, dissemination of project results assumes a high priority. Programs for the improvement of teaching and learning are the hub of current dissemination activity. About half of these programs now include, or are in the process of developing, formal plans for dissemination; virtually all employ some dissemination strategies, whether on a formally organized or ad hoc basis.

By far, the dominant dissemination strategies are those that make use of the grant process itself. These include:

1) awarding grants for dissemination projects (e.g., workshops; in-service faculty training; the establishment of system-wide or state-wide innovation clearinghouses);

2) encouraging interdepartmental and interinstitutional projects that establish lines of communication along which projects results can travel.

The second most popular set of dissemination strategies involve program administrative staff visiting campuses for "show and tell" sessions about "model" projects, and initiating workshops and conferences. Almost equally popular is the use of various types of publications, including:

1) periodic newsletters, describing innovations both within and without the multi-campus system or the State;

2) compilations of titles and/or abstracts of funded proposals;

3) monographs describing particularly successful projects.

While currently in its early stages, several of the larger multi-campus programs are developing a data base, including all funded projects, and a computerized project information retrieval system.

Total Program Evaluation

Virtually all incentive grant programs require a final report of funded projects, and solicit, at one time or another, ad hoc evaluations of specific projects by central staff, outside consultants, or review committee members. However, they have not yet, on the whole, undertaken extensive evaluation of total program impact on the improvement of educational performance. Only about one-fourth of the currently operating programs have made the attempt so far, although several are currently seeking extramural support for such ventures.

Two observations can be made about efforts so far. First, programs for the improvement of teaching and learning and those for fostering interinstitutional cooperation have undertaken total program evaluation on a substantially greater scale than any of the other program types. Second, programs supported by direct State appropriations have undertaken total program evaluation to a far greater extent than those supported by multi-campus discretionary funds or by endowments/gifts/bequests. The coincidence of these trends is undoubtedly a function of the fact that many teaching and learning programs and all but one of the interinstitutional cooperation programs were created and funded via special enabling legislation which indeed mandated that total program evaluation be carried out.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have characterized the incentive grant approach as a resource allocation strategy that may have significant positive impact on educational performance. First, it may provide incentives for the participants in higher education to rechannel both effort and resources into activities that support the new goals of universal access. Secondly, it may, in the "no-growth" era, stimulate initiative for improvement within existing resources, where the prospect of "no-growth," alone, might be expected to discourage initiative and invite stagnation. Finally, its competitive allocation of State funds on a project basis may, if accountability can be properly assured, yield the dual economic benefits of increased productivity, on the one hand, and more effective targeting of resources on the other.

To these potential assets of the incentive grant approach must be added that of flexibility. While we have shown the approach to be conceptually homogeneous, i.e. undergirded by a set of common assumptions, we have seen that, in operation, the technique permits a wide range of variations on a common theme. Thus, it has been employed for the allocation of operating as well as discretionary funds. It can be adopted to the service of campus autonomy as well as centralized control (competition can be sponsored either locally or centrally).

Given these <u>potentially</u> positive impacts and the technique's <u>potential</u> adaptability to a variety of resource allocation

situations, our central question becomes: "Is this potential real or illusory? How well does the approach, both generally and in its concrete variations, actually work?" And while, over the past decade several incentive grant programs have arisen and several have died, we are still no closer to an answer. Quite recently, however, the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education has funded an evaluation of the impact of several incentive grant programs on the improvement of teaching. The preliminary results of these evaluations will provide a first clue to whether the incentive grant approach is indeed a viable response to the problem of stimulating continued educational improvements in the absence of a substantial infusion of new resources.

A P P E N D I X I

Incentive Grant Programs Administered By State Agencies And Multicampus Systems In The Fifty States

INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY STATEWIDE AGENCIES & MULTICAMPUS SYSTEMS IN THE 50 STATES

State	Program Objective: IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING Past	IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING Current	ADVANCING KNOWLEDGE Past	ADVANCING KNOWLEDGE Current	IMPROVING PUBLIC SERVICE Past	IMPROVING PUBLIC SERVICE Current	FOSTERING INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION Past	FOSTERING INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION Current	MULTI-PURPOSE Past	MULTI-PURPOSE Current
Alabama										
Alaska										
Arizona		1*								
Arkansas			2							
California		6		1						
Colorado										
Connecticut						1		1		
Delaware										
Florida		1				1				
Georgia										
Hawaii	1	1								
Idaho						1				
Illinois		2				2		1		
Indiana										
Iowa										
Kansas										

* Numerals indicate the number of discrete incentive grant programs within each "program objective" category that are sponsored by the state's higher education agency and/or by its multicampus systems.

INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY STATEWIDE AGENCIES & MULTICAMPUS SYSTEMS IN THE 50 STATES (cont.

	Program Objective									
	IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING		ADVANCING KNOWLEDGE		IMPROVING PUBLIC SERVICE		FOSTERING INTERINSTI-TUTIONAL COOPERATION		MULTI-PURPOSE	
State	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current	Past	Current
Kentucky						2		1		
Louisiana										
Maine										
Maryland										
Massachusetts										2
Michigan		1		1		1				
Minnesota		1								1
Mississippi										
Missouri	2		1							
Montana										
Nebraska										
Nevada				1						
New Hampshire						1				
New Jersey										1
New Mexico										
New York	1	2		2				1		
North Carolina				1		1				

INCENTIVE GRANT PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY STATEWIDE AGENCIES & MULTICAMPUS SYSTEMS IN THE 50 STATES (cont.)

State	Program Objective: IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING Past	IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING Current	ADVANCING KNOWLEDGE Past	ADVANCING KNOWLEDGE Current	IMPROVING PUBLIC SERVICE Past	IMPROVING PUBLIC SERVICE Current	FOSTERING INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION Past	FOSTERING INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION Current	MULTI-PURPOSE Past	MULTI-PURPOSE Current
North Dakota										
Ohio		1						1		
Oklahoma										
Oregon		2								
Pennsylvania	1									
Rhode Island										
South Carolina										
South Dakota										
Tennessee										
Texas						1				
Utah				1						
Vermont										
Virginia										
Washington	1									
West Virginia										
Wisconsin		1								
Wyoming										
Total States	5	11	2	6	1	8	0	5	0	3
Total Programs	6	19	3	7	1	10	0	5	0	4

A P P E N D I X II

The Characteristics of 55 Incentive Grant Programs,
Organized by Program Type

KEY

COLUMN	VARIABLE	
1	Sponsoring Agency:	The state higher education agency or multicampus system office that administers the incentive grant program in question
2	Name of Program:	
3	Program Status:	either currently "operative" or "defunct"
4	Age of Program:	number of years program has or had, been in operation
5	Program Objective:	see Table I, p. 4 (A Taxonomy of Incentive Grant Programs by Objective and By Strategies for Objective Attainment); roman numeral refers to objective in Table I; letter refers to strategy or activity in Table I for implementary objective
6	Eligibility:	individuals or institutions eligible to receive program support
7	Scope:	number of campuses that were either eligible for, or actually participated in, program during its last year of operations (per operative programs, 1974-75); the numeral represents the number of campuses; the letter "e" indicates "eligibility," while the letter "p" indicates actual participation
8	Annual Level of Program Funding:	in thousands of dollars, for last year of program operation ('74-75 for "operative" programs)
9	Source of Program Support:	see Table II, p. (A Taxonomy of Sources/Modes of Program Funding) roman numerals identifying the "source" of support; letters identify "mode" or subcategory within source
10	Basis of Allocation of Program Funds:	either centrally sponsored <u>open competition</u> among campuses or campus size
11	Average Grant Size:	averaged over all years of program operation
12	Lows of Competition:	either among campuses (intercampus) or within individual campuses (intracampus)
13	Degree of Competitiveness:	for "Intercampus" competition only: % of project proposals submitted that are actually funded, averaged over all years of program operation (insofar as data was available)
14	Was Total Program Evaluation Undertaken:	Yes, No, or Pending
15	Contact:	the individual who either administers or had administered the program, or who is most conversant with details of program operation

IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(10) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(11) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(12) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(13) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(14) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(15) CONTACT
ARIZONA	Arizona Bd. of Regents	Faculty Instructional Improvement Program	Operative	1	P:Ia,Ib,If	f/t faculty; sr.public	3e 3p	75	Ia	campus size	1354.	intra campus	--	Yes	C.T. Moore, Academic Planning Coordinator Arizona Bd. of Regents
CALIFORNIA	Calif. State C&U System	Fund for Innovation & Improvement in the Instructional Process	Operative	3	P:Ia,Ie, IVa S:Ic,Id	f/t faculty; CSUCS	19e 19p	1,400	Ia	open competition	8095.	inter campus	28%	Yes	D. Provost, Dean of New Program Development & Evaluation Calif. State U & Cs
		Mini-Grant Program within PIIIP	Operative	1	P:Ia	same	19e 19p	200	Ia	campus size	1428.	intra campus	--	Yes	D. Provost, Dean of New Program Development & Evaluation Calif. State U & Cs
	U of Calif. Bd. of Regents	Innovative Projects in University Instruction	Operative	7	P:Ia S:Ic	f/t faculty & staff; UC	8e 8p	400	IIa	open competition	10621.	inter campus	37%	Yes	L. McLane, Research Assoc. Office of VP Academic Affairs & Personnel U of Calif.
		Regents' Undergraduate Instruction Improvement Grants	Operative	4	P:Ic S:Ia	f/t faculty; UC	8e 8p	300	IIa	campus size	?	intra campus	--	No	D. Johnson Pres.' Advisory Committee on Instructional Improvement Projects U of Calif.

IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING (cont.)

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(10) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(11) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(12) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(13) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(14) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(15) CONTACT
CALIFORNIA (cont.)	U of Calif. Bd. of Regents (cont.)	State $1-Million Fund for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction	Operative	2	P:Ib,Ia S:Ic	studs. & fac.; all "general" UC campuses	8e 8p	1,000	Ia	campus size	4055	intra campus	--	Yes	L. McLane, Research Assoc. Office of VP Academic Affairs & Personnel U of Calif.
		Regents' Fund for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching	Operative	1	P:IVa,Ia	f/t faculty; UC	9e 9p	150	IIc	open competition	30,000	inter campus	42%	No	D. Johnson Pres.' Advisory Committee on Instructional Improvement Projects U of Calif.
FLORIDA	Div. of CCs,* Dept of Educ.	Staff & Program Development	Operative	6	P:Ia,If S:Ic,Ie	all public CCs	28e 28p	2,100	)a	level of state appropriation for campus operating budget	7093	intra campus	--		H. Kastner, Director Div. of CCs Fla. Dept. of Educ.

* The abbreviation "CCs" for Community Colleges will be used throughout the table.

IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING (cont.)

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(10) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(11) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(12) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(13) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(14) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(15) CONTACT
ILLINOIS	U of Ill. Syst.	Undergraduate Instructional Awards Program	Operative	6	P:Ia,Ic	f/t faculty: U of I	2e 2p	100	IIa	open competition		inter campus	33%	No	B. Munitz, VP Acad. Development & Coordination U of Illinois System
	Ill. CC Bd.	Disadvantaged Student Grants	Operative	2	P:Ia,Id, Ie,IIIa	all public CCs	48e 41p	400	Ib	open competition	7200.	inter campus	36%	Yes	G.R. Darnes, Assoc. Secty Illinois CC Bd.
MICHIGAN	CRLT, U of Mich. Syst.	Instructional Development Fund	Operative	12	P:Ia S:Ie	all instructional staff, incl. grad. assts	3e 3p	35	Ib	open competition	1700.	inter campus	33%	No	J. Kulik, Acting Director Center for Research in Learning & Teaching U of Michigan
MINNESOTA	Minn. State Coll. Syst.	Faculty Improvement Grants	Operative	6	P:If S:Ia	all state coll. campus, except Minn. Metro	6e 6p	220	Ia	campus size	1067.	intra campus	--	No	N.L. Campbell Asst to VC for Academic Affairs Minn. State College System

IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING (cont.)

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	PROGRAM STATUS (3)	AGE OF PROGRAM (in years) (4)	PROGRAM OBJECTIVE (5)	ELIGIBILITY (6)	SCOPE (7)	ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000) (8)	SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT (9)	BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS (10)	AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($) (11)	LOCUS OF COMPETITION (12)	DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS (13)	WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN (14)	CONTACT (15)
MISSOURI	U of Mo. Syst. (Bd of Curators)	Improvement in Teaching Fund	Defunct	1	P:Ia,Ib,Ic	f/t faculty; U of Mo.	4e 4p	500	Ia	open competition	?	inter campus	?	No	P. Keenan, Asst VP for Research U of Missouri System
		Senior Faculty Development Fund	Defunct	1	P:If	senior faculty; U of Mo.	4e 4p	100	Ia	open competition	?	inter campus	?	No	P. Keenan, Asst VP for Research U of Missouri System
NEW YORK	CUNY Syst. (Bd of Higher Ed.)	Chancellor's Grant Program for Curricular Diversity	Operative	3	P:Ia S:Ic,Id	f/t CUNY instructional staff	19e	291	Ib	open competition	32,620.	inter campus	10.3%	No	M.J. Kingkade, Dean for University & Special Programs CUNY
	SUNY Syst. (Bd of Trustees)	Instructional Development Program	Defunct	2	P:Ia,IVa	f/t SUNY faculty	47e	500	Ib	open competition	?	inter campus	?	No	N. Nathanson, Director of Instructional Development SUNY
		Faculty Grants for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction	Operative	3	P:Ia S:Ic	all f/t SUNY faculty	47e	90	IIa	open competition	2148.	inter campus	13%	Pending	N. Nathanson, Director of Instructional Development SUNY

IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING (cont.)

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(10) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(11) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(12) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(13) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(14) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(15) CONTACT
OHIO	Bd of Regents	Instructional Development Program	Operative	1	P:Ie	all pub., priv.; jr & sr HED institutions in Ohio	12p	45	Ib	open competition	*	inter campus	25%	Pending	Lance Buhl, Director Educational Consulting Study
OREGON	Oregon Coordinating Commision	Program for the Improvement of Undergrad Instruction	Operative	6	P:Ia S:Ie,IVa	f/t faculty in public jr & sr colleges**	19e	325	Ia	open competition	11,767	inter campus	18%	Yes & Pending	N.F. Cogan, Program Associate, Oregon Educational Coordinating Council
		Faculty Implementation Grants	Operative	1	P:Ia	f/t faculty in public jr & sr colleges	19e	60	Ia	open competition	under 3000	inter campus	18%		N.F. Cogan, Program Associate, Oregon Educational Coordinating Council
PENNSYLVANIA	Dept. of Educ.	Application of $250,000 for Innovative Programs at the State's Colleges & University	Defunct	1	P:Id S:Ia,Ic	stud.,fac., admin. or bd members in state-owned colls. & univs.	15e 12p	250	Ib	open competition	25,000.	inter campus	?	No	K. Keis, Director Bureau of Academic Programs Dept. of Education

* Compensation in the form of consultant services, not $.

** Private college faculty are eligible to participate in "multicampus" or joint projects.

IMPROVEMENT OF TEACHING & LEARNING (cont.)

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(10) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(11) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(12) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(13) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(14) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(15) CONTACT
WASHINGTON	Wash. Council on Higher Educ.	Innovative Educational Programs	Defunct	2	P:Ia,IVa S:Ic	all public sr. & CC board	20e 20p	1,400	Ic	size of campus instructional budget	9118.	intra campus	--	Pending	E. Kenny, Educational Planner Council on Higher Education
WISCONSIN	Bd of Regents, U of Wisc. Syst.	Undergraduate Teaching Improvement Grants	Operative	3	P:Ia,Ic	f/t faculty; U of Wisc. System	13e 11p	225	'73: IIb '74: Ib	open competition	9305.	inter campus	20%	No	D.O. Peterson, Associate VP Academic Affairs The U of Wisc. System
HAWAII	Bd of Regents, U of Hawaii	Curriculum Development Grants	Defunct	2	P:Ia,Ic	f/t faculty; U of Hawaii System	6e 2p	19	Ib, III	open competition	822.	inter campus	50%	No	R. Kosaki, VP for Academic Affairs U of Hawaii
		Faculty Development Improvement Grants	Operative	½	P:If	f/t faculty; U of Hawaii System	6e	200	III	open competition		inter campus			R. Kosaki, VP for Academic Affairs U of Hawaii
TOTALS: 14 States		25 Programs						$7,386							

ADVANCING KNOWLEDGE

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(10) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(11) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(12) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(13) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(14) (15) CONTACT
AR-KANSAS	Dept. of Higher Education	Arkansas Educational Research Stimulation Project--Faculty Research Grants	De-funct	2	P:IIa S:IIb, If	f/t fac in any HE institution, pub., or private	12p	10	Ib	open competition	400.	inter campus	50%	Yes	G. Chamberlin, Asst. Direotor Dept. of Higher Educ.
		AERSP-Project Development Grant	De-funct	1	P:IIa	any HE institution, pub., or private	12p	15	III	?	?	inter campus		Yes	G. Chamberlin, Asst. Director Dept. of Higher Educ.
CALI-FORNIA	Bd. of Regents, U of Calif.	Regents' Faculty Fellowship Program	Opera-tive	10	P:IIa,b	f/t fac. U of Calif. system	8e	400	IIa	No. of eligible fac. per campus		intra campus		No	L. McLane, Research Director Office of VP, Acad. Affairs U of California
MICHI-GAN	U of Mich.	Faculty Research Grant	Opera-tive		P:IIb	f/t fac. U of Mich.	3e 3p	110	IIa	open competition	4400.	inter campus	?	No	J. Lesch, Director Div. of Research Development & Admin

ADVANCING KNOWLEDGE

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in Years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(10) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(11) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(12) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(13) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(14) CONTACT (15)
MISSOURI	U of Mo. System	Asst. Prof. Research Fund	Defunct	1	P:IIa,b	f/t asst. profs. U of Mo.	4e	100	Ia	open competition		inter campus	?	No	P. Keenan, Asst. VP for Research U of Missouri System
NEVADA	U of Nevada System	Research Stimulation Program	Operative	8	P:IIa,b	p/t & f/t faculty U of Nev.	2e 2p	100	50% Ia 50% IIa	even split between Reno & Las Vegas campuses		intra campus		No	K. D. Jessup, Dir. of Institutional Studies U of Nevada System
NEW YORK	CUNY (Bd. of Higher Educ.)	Faculty Research Award Program	Operative	5	P:IIa, IIb	all f/t instructional staff, jr.& sr. colleges	19e		Ib	open competition	6000.	inter campus	36%	No	B. Braveler Faculty Research Award Program, Research Foundation of CUNY
	SUNY Research Foundation Awards	Faculty Research Fellowships	Operative	20	P:IIa, IIb S:If	f/t fac or admin. at state-operated or community colleges that hold doctorates	43e 34p	750	IIa	open competition	1800.	inter campus	46%	No	P. Tembeau, Grant Administration Director SUNY (Research Foundation)
		Grants-In-Aid	Operative	13	P:IIb	"	43e 34p								

ADVANCING KNOWLEDGE

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(10) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(11) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(12) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(13) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(14) (15) CONTACT
NORTH CAROLINA	Bd. of Governors, U of No. C.	Faculty Development Fund	Operative	13	P:IIb	all f/t fac. at UNC Chapel Hill Greens & No.C. State	3e* 3p	45	IIb & IIa	Tradition		intra-campus		No	R. Dawson, VP for Academic Affairs U of North Carolina
UTAH	State Bd. of Regents	Faculty Research Grants	Operative	?	P:IIa	all sr. pub. HE inst.	2p	2500	IIa**	Level of overhead reimbursements		intra campus		No	H. Alger Asst. Dir. of Academic Affairs Utah State Bd. of Higher Education
TOTALS: 8 States		10 Programs						$5,835							

*Program support limited to the 3 original campuses of the Consolidated U of No.C.: while that body was subsequently reorganized into the current Board of Governors, with authority over 13 additional public campuses, eligibility requirements for support under the program were never revised.

**Board of Regents policy requires sr. public institution to expend 25% of overhead reimbursements on programs for initiating jr. faculty into research activity.

IMPROVING PUBLIC SERVICE

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	PROGRAM STATUS	(3) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(4) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(5) ELIGIBILITY	(6) SCOPE	(7) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(8) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(9) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(10) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(11) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(12) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(13) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(14) CONTACT
CONNECTICUT	Commission on Higher Ed. & State Bd of Ed.	Pilot Projects for Improvement of Teacher Ed. (Public Act 761)	Operative	7	P:IIIc	any joint effort of one or more HED institutions (pub. or priv.) & one or more local school bds	10p	60	Ia	open competition	13846.	inter campus	30%	Yes	L. Rabineau, VC & Director of Program Planning Conn. Commission for Higher Ed.
FLORIDA	Bd of Regents & State U. Syst. of Fla.	Service thru Application of Research (STAR) Program: Project Research & Service	Operative	2	P:IIIb S:IIIa	all sr. public (SUS) institutions	9e	1,300	Ib	open competition	?	inter campus	?	No	J. R. Conner, Director Planning & Analysis State U System of Fla.
IDAHO	Idaho Research Foundation, U. of Idaho	Short-term Applied Research Projects	Operative	3	P:IIIb	f/t fac. in Idaho HE institutions, pub. & priv.; jr. & sr.	9e	75	Ia	open competition	4403.	inter campus	?	No	R. Stark, Director Idaho Research Foundation, Inc.

IMPROVING PUBLIC SERVICE (cont.)

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(8) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(9) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(10) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(11) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(12) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(13) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(14) CONTACT
ILLINOIS	Ill. CC* Bd	Public Service Grant Project	Operative	2	IIIa	all CC districts maintaining a recognized CC	48e 6p	225	Ib	open competition	37500.	inter campus	10%	Pending	G.R. Darnes, Assoc. Secty Illinois CC Bd.
	U of Ill. Syst.	Granite City Steel Scholarship Fund Award	Operative	3	P:IIIb S:IIIc	undergrad, grad & prof. students & research assocs. in UI System	2e 2p	50	III	open competition	1000-3500	inter campus	47%	No	B. Munitz, VP Academic Development & Coordination U of Illinois
KENTUCKY	Council on Public Higher Ed.	Summer Faculty Fellowship Program	Operative	1	IIIb	f/t faculty; all HE institutions (pub. & priv.)	31e	30	Ib	open competition among campus nominees	2500.	inter campus	60%		H.M. Snyder, Jr. Assoc. Director for Administration Council on Public Higher Education

* The abbreviation "CC" for "Community College" will be used throughout the table.

IMPROVING PUBLIC SERVICE (cont.)

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(10) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(11) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(12) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(13) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(14) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(15) CONTACT
KENTUCKY (cont.)	Council on Public Higher Ed.	Area Health Education System (AHES)	Operative	1	P:IIIc	all public institutions in "activated" AHES regions	2/9 AHES regions within state p	2,000	Ia	open competition	?	inter campus	?	No	H. M. Snyder, Jr., Assoc. Director for Administration Council on Public Higher Education
MICHIGAN	U of Mich.	Michigan Memorial Phoenix Project	Operative	2	P:IIIb	all U of Mich. f/t faculty	3e 3p	38	III	open competition	2500	inter campus	50%	No	J. Lesch, Director, Div. of Research Development & Administration U of Michigan
NEW HAMPSHIRE	U System of N.H.	Spaulding Potter Community Services Grants	Operative	3	P:IIIa, Id S:IIIb, Ic	all UNH System faculty	4e 4p	75	III	open competition	3125	inter campus	25%	Yes	W. Henry Resources Development Center U of New Hampshire

IMPROVING PUBLIC SERVICE (cont.)

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(8) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(9) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(10) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(11) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(12) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(13) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(14) (15) CONTACT
NORTH CAROLINA	Bd. of Governors U of No. C.	Program Development Fund	Operative	3	P:IIIb, Ic	all institutions under Bd. of Governors U of N.C.	16e	110	Ib, IIa	open competition	?	inter campus	?	No	R. Dawson, VP for Academic Affairs U of North Carolina
TEXAS	Coordinating Bd. Texas College & U System	Faculty Research Grants	Defunct	2	P:IIIb	all pub. sr.	25e 6p	235	Ia	open competition	11,158	inter campus	?	No	B. Reid, Commissioner, Coordinating Bd., Texas C & U System
TOTALS: 9 States		11 Programs						$4,198							

FOSTERING INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(10) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(11) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(12) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(13) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(14) (15) CONTACT
CONNECTICUT	Commission for Higher Ed.	Contracts with Independent Colleges for Programs, Facilities and Services. (Public Act 72-140)	Operative	2	P: IVf S: IVc, IVe	All priv. HE Insti.	20P	165	Ia	open competition	10739.	inter-campus	44%	yes	L. Rabineau VC and Director of Program Planning Conn. Comm. for Higher Education
ILLINOIS	Board of Higher Ed.	Higher Education Cooperation Act (HECA)	operative	2	P: IVb, IVd S: IVa, IVc	all "non profit" HE insti. (pub. and priv.)	55P	350	Ia	open competition	16666.	inter-campus	28%	yes	R. Miller Associate Director, Academic Affairs Illinois Board of Higher Education
KENTUCKY	Coun. on Public Higher Ed.	Fund for Consortia	operative	2	P: IVb, d	all pub. H.E. Insti.	8E	400	Ia	open competition		inter-campus		pending	H.M. Snyder Associate Director for Administration Council on Public Higher Education

FOSTERING INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(10) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(11) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(12) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(13) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(14) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(15) CONTACT
NEW YORK	SUNY	Chancellor's Fund for Regionalism	operative	1	P:IVb,d S:IVa	all SUNY regions	4 SUNY regions E	20	IIa	open competition	500.	inter campus	--	no	D.Hess Assistant to VC for Community Colleges State University of New York
OHIO	Ohio Board of Regents	Contracts for Services	operative	1	P:IVb, IVf S:IVa IVd	all pub. HE Insti. or consortia*	42P	1000	Ia	open competition	45205	inter campus	22%	pending	G. Stine Assistant to Chancellor Ohio Board of Regents

* while private institutions may not directly receive funds, they are eligible to participate in projects with public institutions

MULTI PURPOSE

STATE	(1) SPONSORING AGENCY	(2) NAME OF PROGRAM	(3) PROGRAM STATUS	(4) AGE OF PROGRAM (in years)	(5) PROGRAM OBJECTIVE	(6) ELIGIBILITY	(7) SCOPE	(8) ANNUAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM FUNDING (add 000)	(9) SOURCE OF PROGRAM SUPPORT	(10) BASIS FOR ALLOCATION OF PROGRAM FUNDS	(11) AVERAGE GRANT SIZE ($)	(12) LOCUS OF COMPETITION	(13) DEGREE OF COMPETITIVENESS	(14) WAS TOTAL PROGRAM EVALUATION UNDERTAKEN	(15) CONTACT
MASSACHUSETTS	Mass. State College System	Special Project Fund	Operative	3	P:IVa, IVd, IIIa, Ia	all institutions within system	9e	250	IIc	open competition	12000.	inter campus	?	No	W. Haas, Assoc. Dir. for Academic Affairs Mass. St. Col. System
		Faculty Initiated Projects	Operative	1		f/t fac. Mass St. College System	9e 3p	50	IIc	campus request	?	intra campus		No	W. Haas, Assoc. Dir. for Academic Affairs Mass. St. Col. System
MINNESOTA	Minn. State College System	Faculty Research Grants	Operative	6	P:IIIb, If S:IIb	f/t fac. Minn. St. College System	6e 6p	25	Ia	campus size	540.	intra campus		No	N.L. Campbell, Asst. to VC for Acad. Affairs Minn. St. Col. System
NEW JERSEY	Dept. of Higher Educ.	Research & Development Fund (R & D)	Operative	3	P:IVb,d; Id S:Ic,Ia	all HE inst. in N.J.(pub. & priv., jr.&sr.) except proprietary & voc./tec inst.	60e 19p	600	Ib	open competition	26.028	inter campus	12.5%	No	J.A. Mitchell, Director, Office of Special Programs Dept. of Higher Educ.
TOTALS: 3 States		4 Programs						$925							

EDUCATION POLICY FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM (EPFP) (formerly Washington Internships in Education) is a national program designed to help provide future leaders the skills in policy-making they must have to exert effective and enlightened leadership in American education. Funds for the program are provided by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations.

Since 1965, the program has placed over 250 mid-career persons in one-year internships in public and private agencies involved in educational policy matters. Carefully recruited sponsors, who are themselves key actors in public policy issues, agree to serve as on-the-job mentors by demonstrating, through their daily tasks, how educational policy is shaped at the State or national level. An important ingredient of the program is the informal weekly seminars through which Fellows interact with decision-makers, eminent authorities and leading specialists in education-related fields. National meetings of Fellows with other special groups contribute further to their understanding of educational policy-making. Fellows' salaries are paid by the sponsoring organizations, while the costs of recruitment, placement and continuing professional development are borne by the EPF Program. Headquartered in Washington with sites in four States, the EPF Program is designed for mid-career persons 25-45 years of age who have completed their academic training. Two-thirds of the forty-five participants in 1975-76 have completed the doctorate degree; all have demonstrated substantial leadership skills and a strong commitment to improving the educational system.

Although EPFP participants are widely considered to be prime candidates for excellent post-Fellowship positions, the EPF Program does not commit itself to obtaining future employment for them. Fellows frequently take leaves of absence from their pre-Fellowship position to participate in the program.

Illinois Coordinator—Robert Bunnell
Massachusetts Coordinator—Ursula Wagener
Michigan Coordinators—Carl Candoli & Matthew Prophet

EDUCATIONAL STAFF SEMINAR (ESS) is a professional development program designed for staff members employed by the Executive and Legislative branches of the Federal Government in the field of education. The goals of ESS are to provide an open forum in which participants can improve their professional capabilities and personal fulfillment on the job by:

a) being exposed to new ideas and perspectives;
b) increasing their knowledge of particular subjects and their understanding of how things actually operate in the field; and
c) meeting with other professionals involved in the legislative and policy formulation processes in an informal learning environment which fosters improved professional relationships.

ESS supplements the Washington work experience with a variety of in-service training seminars and in-the-field observation. It was established in 1969 and is funded by the Institute and by partial reimbursement from the governmental agencies served.

In fiscal year 1975, ESS conducted 73 programs for over 2200 Federal employees. Included were 16 field trips and 57 luncheon/dinner discussion meetings, site visits, demonstrations, and other executive development activities.

THE ASSOCIATES PROGRAM (TAP) is an evolving IEL activity whose emphasis up to now has been the provision of seminars and other forums for legislators and other policy-makers at State capitals. Begun in 1972 with three State educational seminars, TAP now sponsors 21 seminars, all manned by Associates who, on a part-time basis, arrange 5-10 programs annually.

Other TAP efforts—

Maintain a network of State-level "generalists" (Associates) whose ties to IEL in the nation's capital provide rare linkages among Federal and State education policy-setters.

Encourage similar linkages among agencies and coalitions seeking to improve processes of State-level decision-making.

Support attempts of individual State leaders (governors, chief state school officers, legislative committees, etc.) to improve policy-making machinery and to narrow the communications gap which separates political and professional leaders.

OTHER IEL ACTIVITIES

Under a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, IEL has established an issue development service for consideration and transmission of key policy issues in postsecondary education. The **POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY (PECA)** sponsors conferences, research efforts, task force groups and publications focusing on such issues as institutional licensing, consumer protection, and State financing. During 1975-76 the program will add lifelong learning and public policy to its agenda.

IEL and National Public Radio co-produce the **"OPTIONS IN EDUCATION"** series, heard weekly over NPR's 179 member stations from coast to coast. Voice of America rebroadcasts the 1-hour programs, and IEL makes cassettes and transcripts available at minimum cost. In 1974 "Options" received awards from the Education Writers Association and the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education, Mason-Dixon Division. Funds for "Options in Education" are provided by IEL, National Institute of Education, U.S. Office of Education, Robert S. Clark Foundation, NPR, and other grantors.

Under contract from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, HEW, IEL is planning major conference activity early in 1976 for educational decision-makers and administrators on the subject of institutional adjustment to changing sex roles. The goals of the **NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION,** which include increasing training and career options for women in education and facilitating Title IX implementation, will be pursued in cooperation with women's group leaders, policy-makers and the educational community generally.

The **CAREER EDUCATION POLICY PROJECT (CEPP)** addresses the issues of education, work and society. Funded by the U.S. Office of Education, CEPP uses the resources of other IEL programs—ESS, TAP, "Option"—to inform both policy-makers and the public of the issues in the career education movement.